



**PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSESSION
MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 30, 2009
4:00 PM
CITY OF FREDERICKSBURG
715 PRINCESS ANNE STREET
CONFERENCE ROOM 218**

COMMISSION MEMBERS

**Edward F. Whelan, Chair
Roy E. McAfee, Vice Chair
Ricardo Rigual
Berkley Mitchell
Susan Spears
Vincent C. Ramoneda
Roy F. Gratz**

CITY STAFF

**Raymond P. Ocel, Jr., Director
Planning & Community Dev.
Debra M. Ward, Zoning Officer
Erik Nelson, Senior Planner
Marne Sherman, Community
Dev.**

CALL TO ORDER

The September 30, 2009 Planning Commission worksession was called to order at 4:00 p.m. for a discussion on the development of mixed use regulations for residential areas adjacent to Princess Anne Street and Lafayette Boulevard.

Mr. Ocel began the meeting by describing the boundaries of the proposed areas: Along Lafayette Boulevard from the Blue and Gray Parkway to Kenmore Street and along Princess Anne Street from Route 1 to Herndon Street. Mr. Ocel proposes that both districts be one lot deep on either side of the street. The proposed Lafayette Boulevard area currently includes Commercial Highway, Commercial Transitional/Office and Industrial 1 zoning. The proposed Princess Anne Street area is currently zoned Commercial Highway.

Mr. Ocel said these areas were considered suitable for redevelopment as identified in the JumpStart Plan.

Mr. Ramoneda asked if a proposed project could extend to an adjacent lot behind the main corridor.

Mr. Ocel said an extension of the district boundary would require a rezoning.

Mr. McAfee suggested that the Princess Anne Street corridor could include properties on Sofia Street. He then asked if the proposal areas were to be overlays or would be rezoned.

Mr. Ocel said he was proposing a rezoning to a new district. Future discussion should include whether the rezoning would be initiated by the City or the property owner.

Mr. Gratz asked if the Lafayette Boulevard area would include the property on the northwest corner of the intersection of Lafayette Boulevard and the Blue and Gray Parkway.

Mr. Ocel said no, but the Planning Commission should expect to see a rezoning application for that property very soon. That rezoning request would be to the Planned Development Mixed Use District (PDMU), the same as Eagle Village on Route 1.

Mr. Ocel reminded the commission members that while design guidelines were in place for the Princess Anne Street corridor, no design guidelines have been created for the Lafayette Boulevard corridor. The Economic Development Authority (EDA) funded the Princess Anne Street Overlay guidelines and has a grant program for that area in place. It is possible that in the future the EDA may provide grant money for the development of Lafayette Boulevard design guidelines.

Mr. Nelson informed the commission that VDOT funding is already in place for transportation improvements to Princess Anne Street.

Mr. Gratz asked if the creation of this new district would create a lot of nonconformities.

Mr. Ocel responded that staff would have to look at each property to determine nonconformity.

Mr. Ocel recommended that the commission hold a public meeting, early in the amendment process, with property owners that will be affected by this new district. He reminded the commission members that during public meetings with property owners during the creation of the Princess Anne Street Overlay guidelines the owners were most concerned with how the new regulations would affect their individual property.

Mr. Nelson added that during the public meeting process a positive point to make to the property owners is that redevelopment will cause transportation improvements and that in turn will increase the amount of density.

Mr. Whelan stated that he felt it is important to give property owners incentive to improve/redevelop their property and that an increase in permitted density is one way to do that.

Mr. Gratz asked the question of whether the amount of density the committee is recommending could be obtained with the height limitations proposed in the new regulations.

Ms. Sherman asked what type of public review process would be in place for projects. Her concern is that surrounding property owners have a chance to express their views on projects and the possible effect of a project on their neighborhood.

Mr. Ocel said that all projects will have to meet the purpose and intent of the district regulations and that public hearings are held for site plan approvals.

Mr. Nelson said he felt it was important in the wording of an amendment to avoid words such as "pedestrian scale."

Mr. Rigual stated that he felt an amendment should be as flexible as possible.

Mr. McAfee pointed out that the setbacks proposed for the new district appeared to be contrary to the Princess Anne Street guidelines and asked commission members if they were in favor of increasing residential density to three times what is currently allowed.

Mr. Ramoneda offered that a project providing sufficient off street parking should be rewarded by an increase in density.

Mr. Rigual added that density should be increased as much as possible so that projects were not further complicated by having to apply to the City for special approvals.

Mr. Gratz asked why the amendment only allowed limited open space extension into a floodplain.

Mr. Ocel answered that a developer should not be given credit for a requirement that must be met anyway.

Mr. McAfee asked if a developer of a small lot not able to provide the required amount of landscaped open space could be permitted to mitigate the open space requirement off-site. He also asked what exactly would be required for the submission of an illustrative drawing.

Mr. Ocel said an illustrative drawing did not necessarily mean a professional architectural drawing.

Mr. Ramoneda wanted to know if the requirement for an illustrative drawing was to provide information or if the approval of a project would be decided on the acceptability of a drawing.

Mr. Nelson recommended that an illustrative drawing be tied to site plan requirements.

Mr. Ramoneda said in some cases a drawing would be relevant and in others it would not be necessary. He questioned the need for an applicant to provide a drawing that may not be needed.

Mr. Nelson suggested the addition of wording that if the proposed project did not trigger the necessity of a site plan, then a drawing would not be necessary.

Mr. McAfee said the following amendment language was too vague "where applicable, the development includes special provisions for the identification, restoration and preservation of buildings, structures, and sites which have historic, architectural, or archeological significance."


Mr. Ocel stated that he took that language directly from the new PDMU ordinance.

Mr. Ramoneda said he would like to see an incentive given to projects that were able to meet the above-referenced language.

Mr. Nelson stated that if a project involved property not already identified or inventoried by the City as historically significant, then it would not be fair to impose additional provisions on the project. He recommended only those areas in the Comprehensive Plan be subject to special provisions.

- At this time there was a brief, general discussion of the Eagle Village development and what could be done to promote future utilization of the Canal.

Meeting adjourned at 6:15 PM.



Edward F. Whelan, III, Chair